

### Remarks

Applicant requests reconsideration of the Application in view of this Amendment.

Claim 1 is amended for clarity and consistency by replacing "apertures" with "elongate fuel flow passages." Importantly, the fuel flow passages are defined by and between wedge wires.

### Nonanalogous Prior Art

The patent to Hagino, et al. is nonanalogous prior art. As stated at MPEP Section 2141.01(a), a prior art patent is not analogous to the claimed invention if a person having ordinary skill would not reasonably be expected to look to that prior art for a solution to the problem with which the inventor was concerned.

In the present case the inventor was concerned with the problem of producing a stable flame at the burner head. As explained in the specification at page 1, lines 15-17, "Whatever the form of burner head it is important, if they are to function correctly, that the flame produced is of the kind required, predictable and stable and that there is a low risk of flash-back."

The Hagino specification includes the heading "Technical Field to Which the Invention Belongs." Under that heading the specification states "The present invention relates to an aggregation reaction apparatus which is used for concentrating sludge or semi-liquid waste containing suspended solids, and separating liquid therefrom."

It is not reasonable to expect a person of ordinary skill in the art of burner heads and burners to look to the art of liquid processing equipment to solve the problem of producing a stable flame. More specifically, no one concerned with maintaining a stable flame would expect to solve that problem with a device submerged in liquid. It logically follows that the non-analogous prior art disclosure of Hagino, et al. could not have made the claimed invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

### The Analogous Prior Art

A proper consideration of the analogous prior art further indicates that the claimed invention would not have been obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103. For example, prior art U.S. Patent No. 6,699,035 to Brooker teaches that a wedge wire structure "acts to extinguish a flame passing therethrough." See the Brooker specification at column 5, lines 3-7; at column 9, line 63 through column 10, line 15; and at column 10, lines 23-26. The analogous prior art thus provides a thorough explanation of "the flame extinguishing capabilities of the gaps formed between the blunt surfaces 62 and 74 between adjacent windings of spiral wound wedge wire screen."

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action concludes with a reference to the suitability of a known structure for the intended use. Anyone reading the Brooker patent would consider "the flame extinguishing capabilities" of a wedge wire screen to deprive that structure of any conceivable suitability for the intended use of sustaining a stable flame at a burner head. Therefore, the prior art could not have made Applicant's claimed invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Dependent claims 3-7 and 13-14 also are amended for clarity, with claims 13-14 being amended to avoid the product-by-process format. Applicant respectfully submits that each of dependent claims 3-16 recites limitations that distinguish the invention further from the prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103.

In view of these remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen D. Scanlon      Reg. No. 32,755  
Jones Day  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7023